- **IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY**

CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

CONTEMPT PETITION No.284 OF 2006
IN
APPEAL FROM ORDER No.1110 OF 2005

Solapur Zilla Kho-Kho Asso. ... Petitioner

Vs.

Pandurang G. Shinde & Ors. ... Respondents

Mr. R. L. Patil, Advocate for the Petitioner.

CORAM : D. G. KARNIK, J.
DATE : SEPTEMBER 7, 2006.

P.C.

1. Heard the learned counsel for the Petitioner.

2. This Contempt Petition is filed, alleging that the Respondents have committed a breach of the order passed by this Court on 7th June, 2006 in Appeal from Order No. 1110 of 2005.

3. By its order dated 7th June, 2006 this Court allowed the application made by the Petitioner in the suit at Exh. 19, the prayer of which is as follows :-

> During the pendency of the suit, the defendant No.2 (Respondent No.3 herein) be restrained from conducting any tournaments and representing at

affiliated member of the defendant No.1 (Respondent Nos. 1 & 2 herein).

The learned counsel for the petitioner fairly submitted that after the injunction order was passed by this Court on 7th June, 2006, respondent No.3 has not conducted any tournaments, representing itself to be an affiliated member of the Respondent Nos. 1 and 2. In the circumstances, there is no breach of the injunction order passed by this Court.

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner, however submitted that since respondent 3 is not entitled to conduct any tournaments, representing as an affiliated member of the respondents 1 and 2, the petitioner must be allowed to conduct the tournaments. According to him, the contempt is committed by not allowing the petitioner to conduct such tournaments.

5. In my view, the grievance of the petitioner is outside the scope of this Contempt Petition. By the order dated 7th June, 2006 the court only restrained respondent 3 from conducting the tournaments as an affiliated member of respondents 1 and 2. The petitioner was not specifically permitted to conduct the tournaments as a representative of the respondents 1 and 2. In the circumstances, there is no merit in the Petition, which is hereby dismissed.

dismissed.

[D. G. KARNIK, J.]